

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Kyu Dong KIM, et al.

Application No.: 09/725,933

Confirmation No.: 2877

Filed: November 30, 2000

Docket No.: 0766.0002.US

Group Art Unit: 3623

Examiner: DESHPANDE, Kalyan K

For: **SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR AUTOMATING A PROCESS OF BUSINESS
DECISION AND WORKFLOW**

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief – Patents

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL

Sir:

This is an appeal from the final rejection of all pending claims in this application, specifically, claims 1-17 and 19-43. The fee for the appeal brief has been submitted herewith. If further fees are due upon filing of this Brief on Appeal, please charge such fees or credit any overpayment to **Deposit Account No. 50-3698 (H. C. Park & Associates, PLC)**.

The Notice of Appeal was filed on October 27, 2006 with the United States Patent & Trademark Office ("USPTO") along with a Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review. The Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review was mailed on November 20, 2006. Accordingly, Appellants' Brief on Appeal is timely filed on or before December 27, 2006.

In response to the Final Office Action mailed June 27, 2006 ("Office Action") and the Advisory Action mailed September 27, 2006 ("Advisory Action"), Appellants submit that the rejections of record are not proper and are without basis.

(i) IDENTIFICATION OF REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Handysoft Corporation having an office at 1952 Gallows Road, Suite 200, Vienna, VA 22182, which is the assignee of record of the present application.

(ii) RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Upon information and belief of undersigned counsel, appellants and the assignee of record are not aware of any pending appeals or interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

(iii) STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-17 and 19-43 have been rejected and are being appealed.

Claim 18 has previously been canceled.

No claims have been allowed in this application.

(iv) STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments have been filed subsequent to the Office Action.

(v) SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 1 and 32 are independent claims. Claims 2-17 and 19-31 each depend from claim 1. Claims 33-43 each depend from claim 32. The independent claims and the dependent claims on appeal are directed to a system and method for automating a business process in various business environments and workflows, including a system and utility device that can help design and implement a business decision making procedure and workflow automation.

More specifically, claim 1 is directed to a workflow management system for automating a business process, where an administrator executable by a computer manages automating the business process and comprises an organization manager, a role-group manager, an authority

manager, a process manager, and a folder manager. Further, the system includes a form generator executable by the computer, where the form generator designs and operates an electronic form related to the business process, and interfaces with a database, a process designer, a process engine, a web client, and/or a business application program.

Claim 32 is directed to a method for automating a business process. The process includes steps for modeling the business process, where the step for modeling the business process further includes generating an organization chart; and executing the business process, where the step of executing the business process includes allocating the activity to a participant, and designing and creating an electronic form related to the business process.

(vi) GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The issue on appeal is whether claims 1-13, 19-20, 24, 26, and 28-31 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,430,538, issued to Bacon, *et al.* ("Bacon"); claims 14, 16-17, 25, 27, and 32-43 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bacon; and whether claims 15 and 21-23 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bacon in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,911 issued to Berg, *et. al.* ("Berg").

In the Office Action, claims 1-13, 19-20, 24, 26, and 28-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Bacon.¹ In rejecting independent claim 1, the examiner cited administration interface 140 to illustrate that Bacon teaches "an administrator executable by the computer, wherein the administrator manages automating the business process and comprises an organization manager, a role/group manager, an authority manager,

¹ Office Action, pages 7-19.

and a folder manager.”² The examiner further cited the system including a browser and java applet to indicate that Bacon teaches “a form generator executable by the computer, where the form generator designs and operates an electronic form related to the business process, and interfaces with a database, a process designer, a process engine, a web client, and/or a business application program”.³

Further in the Office Action, claims 14, 16-17, 25, 27, and 32-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bacon.⁴ Additionally, claims 15 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bacon in view of Berg.⁵ In rejecting independent claim 32, the examiner noted that “Bacon fails to teach [the steps of] modeling the business process, wherein the step of modeling includes generating an organization chart.”⁶ The examiner relied upon the assertion that “it is old and well-known in the art to develop an organization chart that maps the relationships between all participating members in an organization...It would have been obvious...for one of ordinary skill in the art to develop an organization chart containing information regarding the relationship between the department and rank of a member in a department and incorporate this information to the Bacon system in order to clearly define the responsibilities of each participating member and determine ultimately who is responsible for each activity.”⁷

² Office Action, page 3.

³ Office Action, page 9.

⁴ Office Action, pages 19-32.

⁵ Office Action, pages 32-34.

⁶ Office Action, page 25.

⁷ Office Action, page 20.

No amendments were filed subsequent to the Office Action. Rather, Applicants presented arguments to further distinguish the present invention from Bacon and to address the examiner's arguments presented in the Office Action.⁸

In the Advisory Action, the examiner restated arguments previously presented in the Office Action without addressing Applicants' new arguments.⁹

(vii) ARGUMENT

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

A *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established to support a rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102. The examiner fails to show that a single prior art reference discloses each and every element of the claims under consideration.

Further, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established to support a rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. First, there is no motivation, either in or outside of the cited references, to combine or modify the cited references. Even if there is motivation to combine or modify the cited references and a reasonable expectation of success exists, the cited references fail to disclose every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, the pending rejections should be withdrawn and the claims should be allowed to issue.

THE LEGAL STANDARD

A rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 cannot stand where the examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Anticipation "requires the disclosure in a single

⁸ Reply Under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 mailed September 7, 2006

⁹ Advisory Action, page 2.

prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration."¹⁰ Further, "when evaluating the scope of a claim, every limitation in the claim must be considered. USPTO personnel may not dissect a claimed invention into discrete elements and then evaluate the elements in isolation. Instead, the claim as a whole must be considered."¹¹ As the Federal Circuit stated, "[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim."¹²

A rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 cannot stand where the examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.¹³ In the absence of a *prima facie* case of obviousness, an applicant who complies with the other statutory requirements is entitled to a patent.¹⁴

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the reference or references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. The motivation to modify the prior art and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based upon a patent applicant's disclosure.¹⁵

¹⁰ *W.L. Gore & Assocs. V. Garlock*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984).

¹¹ *U.S.P.T.O. Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility*, page 9, October 26, 2005 (emphasis in original).

¹² *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added).

¹³ *In re Deuel*, 51 F.3d 1552, 1557, 34 USPQ2d 1210, 1214 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

¹⁴ *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

¹⁵ *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Finally, a conclusion of obviousness is evaluated not only with respect to whether the examiner has met his burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness, but also with respect to whether rebuttal evidence has been evaluated fully and fairly.¹⁶

In this case, insufficient support exists to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation and obviousness. Therefore, the rejections of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 should be withdrawn.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

1. BACON FAILS TO DISCLOSE EVERY CLAIM LIMITATION IN CLAIM 1

Claim 1 recites a workflow management system for automating a business process, where an administrator executable by a computer manages automating the business process and comprises an organization manager, a role-group manager, an authority manager, a process manager, and a folder manager. Further, the system includes a form generator executable by the computer, where the form generator designs and operates an electronic form related to the business process, and interfaces with a database, a process designer, a process engine, a web client, and/or a business application program.

For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 to stand, a single prior art reference must disclose each and every claim limitation under consideration. The Examiner must consider every claim limitation without dissecting the claimed invention into discrete elements and then evaluating the elements in isolation.

Bacon fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features. The examiner relies upon Bacon which discloses "an administration interface [which] enables a supervisor to

¹⁶ *In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1470-73, 223 USPQ 785, 787-88 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

manage the system"¹⁷ to illustrate "an administrator executable by the computer, wherein the administrator manages automating the business process and comprises an organization manager, a role-group manager, an authority manager, a process manager, and a folder manager." (*emphasis added*)¹⁸

Rather, Bacon discloses an administration interface 140 that allows a person (supervisor) to manage the system as required.¹⁹ Bacon fails to teach or suggest a computer executable administrator that comprises an organization manager, a role/group manager, an authority manager, a process manager, and/or a folder manager (*emphasis added*). In other words, the alleged administrator, administration interface 140, does not have the aforementioned features as disclosed in claim 1.

Further, Bacon fails to teach or suggest at least "a form generator executable by the computer, where the form generator designs and operates an electronic form related to the business process, and interfaces with a database, a process designer, a process engine, a web client, and/or a business application program." The examiner concludes that "the java applet is a form generator."²⁰ The examiner also states that "the java applet allows for the user of graphic objects, data input cells, and access to the database."²¹ Unlike the examiner's allegations, Bacon simply discloses a java applet that is included in a HTML page and when a predefined java applet is executed by the server in response to a user selection, the java applet distributes that selected work item to a client.²² Bacon fails to teach or suggest that the java

¹⁷ Office Action, pages 3 and 7 (citing generally to Bacon, column 5, lines 13-14).

¹⁸ Office Action, pages 2-3 and 7-8 (citing generally to Bacon, column 4, line 38 to column 5, line 14).

¹⁹ Bacon, column 5, lines 13-14.

²⁰ Office Action, page 9.

²¹ Office Action, page 9.

²² Bacon, column 7, line 10 to column 8, line 40.

applet designs and operates an electronic form related to the business process. Hence, Bacon fails to disclose every claim limitation in consideration for claim 1.

Thus, the examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1, and all claims that depend therefrom, should be withdrawn.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 32

2. THERE IS NO SUGGESTION OR MOTIVATION DISCLOSED IN BACON TO MODIFY BACON TO ARRIVE AT THE PRESENT INVENTION

Claim 32 recites a method for automating a business process. The process includes steps for modeling the business process, where the step for modeling the business process further includes generating an organization chart; and executing the business process, where the step of executing the business process includes allocating the activity to a participant, and designing and creating an electronic form related to the business process.

For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 to stand, there must be a suggestion or motivation to combine or modify the references.²³ The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resulting combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination.²⁴ A suggestion to combine or modify the references may come from the prior art references cited against the claims.

However, in the Office Action, the examiner points to no specific suggestion or motivation in Bacon to modify the teachings of Bacon. In rejecting independent claim 32, the examiner notes that "Bacon fails to teach [the steps of] modeling the business process, wherein

²³ *In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1470-73, 223 USPQ 785, 787-88 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

²⁴ *In re Mills*, 916F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

the step of modeling includes generating an organization chart.”²⁵ The examiner further cites paragraphs in Bacon, which simply describe process definitions that are patentably distinguishable from the modeling process of the present invention.²⁶ Hence, Bacon fails to disclose the modeling process as recited in claim 32. Thus, absent a specific motivation or suggestion to modify Bacon, the examiner fails to demonstrate a sufficient motive for modifying Bacon to render the present invention obvious.

3. THE EXAMINER HAS FAILED TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE OF ANY SUGGESTION OR MOTIVATION TO MODIFY BACON

The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has indicated that motivation to combine or modify references in an obviousness rejection need not be found exclusively in the cited references, and may be found in the nature of the problems solved, or the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art.²⁷ However, the examiner has failed to provide sufficient evidence from outside the cited references to establish that it would have been within the ordinary skill in the art to modify the prior art to teach the claimed invention. “When not from the prior art references, the ‘evidence’ of motive will likely consist of an explanation of the well-known principle or problem-solving strategy to be applied.”²⁸ Such explanation is noticeably absent from the Office Action.

In support of the examiner’s modification of Bacon, the examiner relies upon a statement that “it is old and well-known in the art to develop an organization chart that maps the

²⁵ Office Action, page 25.

²⁶ Bacon, column 4, lines 22-38.

²⁷ *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int'l Inc.*, 174 F.3d 1308, 50 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

²⁸ *Dystar Textilfarben GMBH & CO Deutschland KG v. Patrick Co.*, 06-1088, p. 18 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

relationships between all participating members in an organization...It would have been obvious...for one of ordinary skill in the art to develop an organization chart containing information regarding the relationship between the department and rank of a member in a department and incorporate this information to the Bacon system in order to clearly define the responsibilities of each participating member and determine ultimately who is responsible for each activity."²⁹ Hence, the examiner simply alleges that the organization chart is obvious, failing to suggest any reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the aforementioned process definition teachings of Bacon to teach "steps for modeling the business process, wherein the step for modeling the business process further includes generating an organization chart." While the modification of Bacon with the knowledge generally available to a person of ordinary skill in the art may be possible, the examiner provides insufficient support that such a modification of Bacon would be desirable. In absence of such an explanation, the examiner's conclusory statement is insufficient to support a motivation to modify Bacon.

Thus, in absence of a sufficient motivation to modify Bacon, the examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

4. EVEN IF BACON COULD BE MODIFIED WITH KNOWLEDGE GENERALLY AVAILABLE TO A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART, BACON WOULD FAIL TO TEACH OR SUGGEST ALL LIMITATIONS RECITED IN CLAIM 32

Last, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established where the combined or modified references fail to teach or suggest all limitations of the claimed invention. Because neither Bacon nor knowledge generally available to a person of ordinary skill in the art discloses all features of claim 32, the rejection thereof cannot stand.

²⁹ Office Action, page 20.

Claim 32 recites a method for automating a business process. The process includes steps for executing the business process, where the step of executing the business process includes allocating the activity to a participant, and designing and creating an electronic form related to the business process.

As noted above with respect to claim 1, Bacon fails to disclose designing and creating an electronic form related to the business process. Bacon simply discloses a java applet that is included in a HTML page. The predefined java applet in Bacon can neither design nor create an electronic form related to the business process as disclosed in claim 32. The java applet simply distributes a selected work item to a client at the server's request.³⁰

Accordingly, since Bacon and/or knowledge generally available to a person of ordinary skill in the art fails to disclose all features of independent claim 32, the rejection of claim 32, and all claims that depend therefrom, should be withdrawn.

³⁰ Appeal Brief, pages 7-9.

CONCLUSION

With respect to claim 1, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established because Bacon fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation under consideration. With respect to independent claim 32, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because there is no motivation to combine or modify the cited references. Even if there were motivation to combine or modify the cited references and a reasonable expectation of success, the cited references fail to disclose every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, the pending rejections of claims 1-17 and 19-43 cannot be allowed to stand. Accordingly, claims 1-17 and 19-43 are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: December 27, 2006

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike, Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/BYC/tmk

(viii) CLAIMS APPENDIX

Pending Claims on Appeal

1. A workflow management system for automating a business process, comprising:
a computer;

an administrator executable by the computer, wherein the administrator manages automating the business process and comprises an organization manager, a role/group manager, an authority manager, a process manager, and a folder manager;

a process designer executable by the computer, wherein the process designer determines flows and properties of the business process and defines an activity that is performed in the business process;

a database accessible by both the administrator and the process designer, wherein the database stores organization information, authority information, and folder information relating to the business process;

a process engine executable by the computer, wherein the process engine executes the business process and allocates the activity to the participant, monitors a start and end of the activity, facilitates storing a result of the activity, and/or interfaces with the database, another workflow engine, and/or a business application program;

a web client, that interfaces with the process engine, the another workflow engine, and/or the business application program, and wherein the web client permits a user to interact with the system; and

a form generator executable by the computer, wherein the form generator designs and operates an electronic form related to the business process, and wherein the form generator interfaces with the database, the process designer, the process engine, the web client, and/or the business application program.

2. The workflow management system of claim 1,
wherein the organization manager creates, deletes, and maintains information about a department associated with the business process;
wherein the role/group manager creates, deletes, and maintains information about a role and a user group associated with the business process;
wherein the authority manager creates, deletes, and maintains information about an authority that can access the business process and the application program, and wherein the authority manager further allocates the authority information to the information about the role, the group and a member of at least one of the department and the user group; and
wherein the folder manager creates, deletes, and maintains information about a folder.
3. The workflow management system of claim 2, further comprising an object manager, wherein the object manager interfaces the administrator with the database.
4. The workflow management system of claim 3, wherein the database further comprises:
an organization database;
authority database; and
a folder database.
5. The workflow management system of claim 1, wherein the process designer comprises:
a graphic designer executable by the computer that creates and designs an activity and the business process using a graphical user interface; and
a property designer executable by the computer that defines a property of the activity to

be executed in the business process.

6. The workflow management system of claim 5, wherein the property designer further comprises an object manager that interfaces the designer with the database.

7. The workflow management system of claim 6, wherein the database comprises:
a process definition folder that contains information related to the business process modeling;

a data folder that contains data generated by the business process execution; and
an organization folder.

8. The workflow management system of claim 1, wherein the web client further comprises:
a worklist handler;
a workitem handler; and
a process monitor.

9. The workflow management system of claim 8, wherein the worklist handler maintains a work list for a user.

10. The workflow management system of claim 9, wherein the workitem handler supports execution of the business process.

11. The workflow management system of claim 10, wherein the process monitor checks status of the business process.

12. The workflow management system of claim 11, wherein the process monitor further checks a history of the business process and current progress of the business process.
13. The workflow management system of claim 12, wherein the process monitor further monitors resource utilization.
14. The workflow management system of claim 2, wherein the organization manager further creates, deletes and maintains i) information about relationships between the department, rank of a member in the department and/or user group, and ii) information regarding the member in the department and/or user group.
15. The workflow management system of claim 14, wherein the organization manager further registers a signature of each member of the department and/or user group.
16. The workflow management system of claim 2, wherein the role/group manager allocates the member information to the role information and the user group information.
17. The workflow management system of claim 2, wherein the authority manager allocates the authority information to information about the role, the group and the member of the department and/or the user group.
18. (Canceled)
19. The workflow management system of claim 5, wherein the property designer creates, deletes, and maintains a business rule associated with the business process.

20. The workflow management system of claim 19, wherein the business rule includes information that defines a term associated with the business process, defines a condition associated with the business process, and/or defines a transition path to be used when the activity is completed.
21. The workflow management system of claim 5, wherein the process designer further comprises a check-out table.
22. The workflow management system of claim 21, wherein the check-out table contains information on a process model currently checked-out by a user.
23. The workflow management system of claim 22, wherein the system keeps a currently checked-out process model from being simultaneously checked-out by another user by referring to the check-out table.
24. The workflow management system of claim 1, wherein the process engine comprises:
- an interface agent that interchanges information about a status of the business process with other process engines;
 - a request manager that receives requests from the user, directs the process engine to handle the requests, and returns results to the user;
 - a dispatcher that retrieves and executes the requests and stores results in the database;
 - a scheduler;

a security manager that controls a certification process with an outside certification server; and

a database broker that interfaces with the process engine and the database.

25. The workflow management system of claim 24, wherein the process engine allocates the activity to the participant and a status the activity comprises one of a state selected from the group consisting of: an initial state; a waiting state; a dead state; a running state; a suspended state; a completed state; a terminated state; an error state; and an overdue state.

26. The workflow management system of claim 24, wherein the scheduler manages a deadline of the activity and/or a waiting state of the activity.

27. The workflow management system of claim 24, wherein the security manager further encodes and decodes information.

28. The workflow management system of claim 25, wherein the activity transits among the states according to a business rule.

29. The workflow management system of claim 28, wherein the process engine controls the workflow using a transition count to keep the transitions between activity states consistent with the business rule.

30. The workflow management system of claim 29, wherein the process engine sets to zero the transition counts of all the transitions that can be processed in a forward direction from the activity, when the activity is started.

31. The workflow management system of claim 30, wherein the process engine further sets to one the transition counts of the transitions stemming from execution of the activity, when the activity is completed.

32. A method for automating a business process, the method comprising steps of:
modeling the business process, wherein the step of modeling includes generating an organization chart;
defining an activity that is performed in the business process;
accessing, from a database, organization information, authority information, and/or folder information relating to the business process;
executing the business process, wherein the step of executing the business process includes allocating the activity to a participant, and designing and creating an electronic form related to the business process; and
monitoring the business process, wherein the step of monitoring the business process comprises monitoring a start and end of the activity, facilitating storing a result of the activity, and/or interfacing with a workflow program and/or business application program.

33. The method of claim 32, wherein the step of modeling the business process further comprises:
mapping at least one of departments, members, member titles and member roles to generate the organization chart;
creating a role; and
allocating an authority to the role.

34. The method of claim 32, wherein the step of modeling the business process further comprises:

mapping at least one of departments, members, member titles and member roles to generate the organization chart;
creating a group of human resources; and
allocating an authority to the group of human resources.

35. The method of claim 32, wherein the step of designing a process further comprises:

identifying an activity to be executed; and
allocating a property to the activity.

36. The method of claim 35, wherein the activity comprises:

a start activity that starts a process;
a normal activity that involves an intervention by a participant;
a wait activity;
a mail activity;
an SQL activity that accesses an application database;
a sub-process activity that comprises a plurality of separate activities;
an agent activity that automatically activates a program;
a connector activity; and
an end activity that represents an end of the process.

37. The method of claim 35, wherein the property comprises:

participant information that describes an individual that executes the activity;
application information that describes a business application to be used by the individual

to execute the activity;

post-condition information that determines when the activity is completed;

schedule information that describes planning of the activity;

deadline information that describes timing for executing the activity;

sub-process information that describes a location and an option of the sub-process activity;

parameter information that defines a value necessary for executing a program in an agent activity;

mail-to information that determines a recipient of e-mail in a mail activity;

mail content information that represents the content of e-mail in the mail activity;

general information that shows a name and description of the activity;

transition condition information that represents conditions for an input transition and an output transition; and

icon information to display an icon on a graphical user interface.

38. The method of claim 35, wherein the participant can comprise one of or any combination of a user, a department and the role.

39. The method of claim 38, wherein the participant can be a manager of the participant.

40. The method of claim 38, wherein the participant can be a peer of the participant.

41. The method of claim 38, wherein the participant can be a department of the participant.

42. The method of claim 38, wherein activity is allocated based on a workload of the

participant.

43. The method of claim 32, wherein generating an organization chart comprises mapping information about a department, a member name, a member title, and a member role.

(ix) EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No Evidence is submitted in this Brief.

(x) RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

Upon information and belief of counsel, appellants and the assignee of record are not aware of any pending appeals or interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal. Consequently, this Appendix is empty.